

Provisions to tackle all of these challenges are contained within the bill. They have good support. The Director of the United States Geological Survey, the CEOs of the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, and the National Electrical Manufacturers Association are among some. State witnesses, former military officials, and many others have endorsed this approach. We have a good opportunity to bring our mineral policies into the 21st century, and the mineral subtitle in this bipartisan Energy bill offers us that chance.

I want to note the other members of the energy committee who have been very helpful in helping to advance this legislation. Senator RISCH was very helpful as was Senator CRAPO of Idaho and Senator HELLER. They were all cosponsors of the original bill with me. There were many other cosponsors from both sides of the aisle in recent Congresses, and we also thank the Presiding Officer for his support as well.

I also wish to acknowledge Secretary Moniz, the Secretary of Energy, and his team over there at DOE, and Director Kimball, who is the Director of the U.S. Geological Survey. They helped us a lot when it came to drafting this bill, and I thank them for that.

I have consumed more time than I should, but I hope everyone can hear the enthusiasm I have in ensuring that as we modernize our energy policies, we do not take a step forward to help address what we need to do on the energy front and fail to bring along the growing concerns that we have in needing to modernize and understand our mineral resources and how we can ensure that there is that level of true energy security that helps us with our economic security and certainly our national security.

With that, I see that my colleague from Alabama is here, so I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Alaska for her leadership and comments on this bill, and I will have thoughts on that subject as we go forward. We have had some good things happen in energy, and we need to keep having that happen. Energy serves the American people. A low cost of energy is a blessing, a high cost of energy is a detriment to working families.

I truly believe we need to make clear to the American people that those of us, like the Senator from Alaska who fought to increase production of energy, have done so not to provide a profit to private companies but to have created a situation in which the price of energy would decline. We have had a large surge in energy, and sure enough the prices have declined. I think that is a good thing.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to share some thoughts tonight, before we go out, about the trade issue this Nation is facing, and it is a highly significant issue. The President is expected to sign the Trans-Pacific Partnership on February 4. It is a historic event. It cannot become law of the United States of America. It is detrimental to this economy. It is particularly detrimental to people who go to work every day and would like more jobs. They would like higher paying jobs and better benefits. It is detrimental to that, and we are going to establish that point. We have a Presidential campaign going on today and people need to talk about it. The American people need to know where their candidates stand on it.

Well, let me share a few thoughts tonight and begin this discussion. The President is expected to sign the agreement on February 4. He negotiated this agreement with 11 different countries in the Pacific region. At some point he will implement legislation and then Congress will vote on whether to go forward. The legislation is part of the fast-track process, so it will not be filibustered. The bill will come up on a simple majority vote. No amendments will be allowed. It will simply be an up-or-down vote.

What is happening in the world trade market today? On Monday, January 25 of this week, Ford announced that they were leaving the Japanese and Indonesian markets. Indonesia and Japan are good friends of ours. They are good countries, but they are tough trading partners. Why did Ford leave Japan? They sell automobiles all over the world. They sell them in Europe, Mexico, and South America. Why are they not able to compete in Japan?

What did Ford say? They said that nontariff barriers have prevented them from selling cars in the market. In 2015, Ford sold less than 5,000 cars in Japan, representing six-tenths of 1 percent of the Japanese automobile market. In fact, only 6 percent of the automobiles sold in Japan are manufactured outside of Japan. It is not a question of tariffs. That is not the problem in dealing with Japan and importing cars into Japan. The Japanese have erected substantial nontariff barriers. In fact, Hyundai, a very fine South Korean automobile company in my state, attempted to sell in Japan for some time, and they recently gave up.

What is the policy of Japan? The truth is Japan talks about free trade, but like most of our Asian allies and trading competitors, they are mercantile. The essence of having a successful mercantile economy is to export more and import less. This is the reality we are dealing with. The people who are and have been negotiating our trade agreements don't seem to understand this or don't care. In fact, they basically say: Well, if someone sells a product cheaper here, we don't care.

We will buy it. They don't worry if we can't sell products in their country.

A trading agreement is a contract between two nations—we were all taught that in law school—and it should serve the interests of both parties. When a contract ceases to advantage both parties, you abandon the contract. It shouldn't be signed or it should end.

What else about this agreement? It creates an international commission—a commission of the 11 or 12 countries, including the United States. The language, by definition of our own administration, is that the agreement is a living agreement.

The Presiding Officer is a fine lawyer. He has worked at the court of appeals. I know a living agreement makes the hair on the back of his neck stand up. It makes you nervous. A living agreement is no agreement at all. It can just be changed. They acknowledge and repeatedly say in the fast-track documents that nations can meet and change the agreement anytime they want. They can update it for changed circumstances, which is what activist judges say when they redefine the meaning of the U.S. Constitution. They like to say that they are updating it for changed circumstances.

Well, Congress is supposed to do that, it seems to me, but anyway this agreement is a living agreement. It contains 5,554 pages. It is twice the length of the Holy Scriptures. It includes section 27, which sets up an international commission with nearly unregulated power. In fact, our own U.S. Trade Representatives—our own Web site—states that the Commission is formed “to enable the updating of the agreement as appropriate to address trade issues that emerge in the future as well as new issues that arise with the expansion of the agreement to include new countries.” Congress would be launching such an event into the future. Well, what is our problem?

Well, what is one of the major problems that we have today? It is our substantial trade deficit. One report, which I think is probably conservative, says that one-half of 1 percent of the GDP has been lost in the United States as a result of our trade deficit. That is probably an acceptable economic estimate, and that is significant. When you have 2 percent GDP, you are losing 25 percent based on the trade deficit. We have to have growth in this country, more GDP, more Americans working, more people with better jobs and better pay, and part of that is manufacturing.

The final figures for 2015 are expected to show that the bilateral trade deficit with China is increased to 8 percent to a record of around \$365 billion. China is not a part of these 12 nations, but it has openly been said that they could be made a part of it in the future if countries vote them in.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, growing U.S. trade deficits with China through 2013 eliminated 3.2 million jobs. Is that an accurate figure? I don't know for sure, but no one

disputes that trade deficits with China have cost more than 1 million jobs. When you lose 1 million jobs, people go on welfare, need unemployment compensation or retire early. All of these are damaging events to the American economy.

The White House claims that this Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement—this trade agreement—is critical to limit China's economic influence. We are going to hear about that a lot. We are going to hear the national security argument. However, a new study just released this month by the World Bank shows that China will actually see an increase in export potential if the TPP is approved by Congress. It is not going to constrict China. The World Bank says it is going to increase China's ability to export.

The report by the World Bank stated that the overall impact on China would be "really negligible." It is not a good argument to state that it is somehow going to boost other economies in the United States as it relates to China. China is not going to be hurt by this agreement.

The World Bank study further reports that Japan would see an extra economic growth of 2.7 percent by 2030 while the United States could expect only nominal growth of perhaps four-tenths of 1 percent.

Robert Scott of the Economic Policy Institute states that the TPP could slow the reshoring of American jobs, especially in the automobile sector.

We have had a nice development in recent years. My State has benefited so tremendously from foreign automobile investments. Instead of making automobiles in Korea, Germany, and Japan, they built plants around the country, and some were built in my home State of Alabama, and make the automobiles there.

I don't think there is any doubt that this agreement could reduce job reshoring because there is a small tariff on imported automobiles and that would be eliminated so that little advantage in moving a plant to the United States would be lost.

Get this. The Fact Checker at the Washington Post gave the President's claim that the Trans-Pacific Partnership would create 650,000 jobs four Pinocchios. That is a pretty bad falsehood. They ought to give it five Pinocchios.

Let's talk about reality. I have talked about trade agreements. Republicans favor trade agreements. I favor trade agreements, but they have to be good agreements. You have to be careful. What about this Korea trade agreement with our friends in South Korea. They are smart negotiators. Last year our trade deficit with South Korea from January to November—we don't have the numbers for December yet—was \$26 billion. Maybe the rest of the year will be about \$28 to \$29 billion. That would be about 15 percent higher than last year's trade deficit with South Korea.

President Obama signed the agreement in 2010. When he signed it, President Obama promised that the South Korea trade deal would increase American exports to South Korea by \$11 billion a year. All right. I want to be co-operative. We like our allies in South Korea, and I voted for the agreement. But what happened? Over 11 months of last year the United States exported 1.2 billion more than we did when the deal was signed in 2010—not \$10 or \$11 billion more, \$1.2 billion. The year before that it was \$0.8 billion. We haven't seen a surge of exports to South Korea. Didn't the negotiators know that? They told us differently.

What about South Korea's imports to the United States—their exports to the United States; what about them? They have risen not \$1 billion but instead \$20 billion. Since 2010 our trade deficit with South Korea has risen nearly 260 percent, from \$10 billion in 2010 to about \$28 billion last year. That is a stunning development.

So we are going to have to vote on this. And we have been told and we have beliefs that things are going to be better than that. It is not happening in that way. I urge us to study the facts and figures to be realistic. Trade is a good thing, and I have been a supporter. But it is not a religion with me. It is a contract. It is a deal, and deals are to serve the interests of the American people. It has not been doing so. Even the Peterson Institute, which supports these trade agreements, said there would be 120,000 fewer manufacturing jobs over the next 9 years if this agreement takes place in the United States.

Mr. President, I see our leader. He has had a busy week. I appreciate the opportunity to share these remarks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

FAREWELL TO MIKE BRUMAS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, before the Senator from Alabama leaves the floor, we had an opportunity this afternoon to say goodbye to a good man, Mike Brumas, who worked for both of us here in the Senate. It was a really good chance to thank an old friend of both of ours; didn't the Senator from Alabama think so?

Mr. SESSIONS. I think so. People wonder about whom we get to work for us up here and who is helping to run this government. But Mike Brumas—14 years at the Birmingham News. I don't think there is any doubt he was the most popular reporter in the State of Alabama for me and other people, and he was a great asset to me and to the majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I particularly enjoyed the observation of the Senator from Alabama of taking the chance of bringing somebody over from the dark side and had some doubts about whether he could make the transition, but he obviously did it very well.

Mr. SESSIONS. He really did. He was loyal to me, and I know he was loyal to you, and he shared the visions we have tried to execute. I think the size of the crowd and the enthusiastic well wishes he got were a testament to the quality of his contribution.

I thank the majority leader for hosting that event.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN CHOWNING

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a good friend of mine and a friend to the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Dr. John Chowning, who served as the vice president for church and external relations and executive assistant to the president at Campbellsville University, has recently retired from that post after more than a quarter century with that institution. I know he is going to be greatly missed by his colleagues, by the higher education community across the State, and by all of us who work on and care about education issues.

Dr. Chowning first became involved in fundraising for Campbellsville University in 1989. He became a member of the university's board of trustees in 1992. He served on that board for 7 years, including service as board chair. Then he became a full-time employee in 1998. He taught at the school for several years as an adjunct in the political science department and served as chair of the university's diversity committee, strategic planning, and university council.

In his various roles throughout the years, Dr. Chowning has taken the lead or been a major influence on several important issues. He established a dialogue on race to foster racial reconciliation. He led Greater Campbellsville United, an organization that strives to create opportunity for all residents of the Campbellsville-Taylor County region. He helped found the Campbellsville-Taylor County Economic Development Authority and served as its chairman.

Working with the Economic Development Authority, he led the way to create a dislocated worker program in Campbellsville when a factory in the region closed and caused jobs to leave the area. And I am proud of the work he and I did together to help create the university's Technology Training Center, a partnership with local governments and Campbellsville University to provide training to the local workforce.

The list of people who are congratulating Dr. Chowning on a remarkable career of service is long, and I am proud to add my name to that list. I am pleased by the fact that Dr. Chowning will remain on in a part-time capacity so Campbellsville University and the Commonwealth can continue to reap the benefit of his knowledge, wisdom, and experience. I want to wish him and his family the very best as he begins this new chapter.